

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/690,088	10/21/2003	Harald Kaspar	58136US004	4837	
32692	7590 11/17/2005		EXAMINER		
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY			HU, HENRY S		
PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1713	1713	
			DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/690,088	KASPAR ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Henry S. Hu	1713		

	Henry S. Hu	1713					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or a TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	•						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	, ,,	maliant Amandmant	DTOL 224)				
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected to:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
	2	- Wh					
17.15 11-11-0+	D	AVID M. Man					
/	CSIVERVISON	RY PATENT EXAMINED					
11-11-06	•	CY CENTED 1700					



Continuation of 3. NOTE: The incorporation of "fluorinated liquid having a boiling point of at least 50 oC" as well as the limitation of dependent Claim 14 as "said copolymer contains recurring units deriving from the hydrocarbon olefin in an amount of 10 to 70 mol%" into parent Claim 1 is recongnized. It is clearly a narrow down from the original parent Claim 1 which does not contain such two extra limitations. The scope of Claim 4 is also clearly changed since it now requires all of the hydrogen atoms be replaced with fluorine atoms. However, it does not place the application for allowance after final action because:

With such two extra limitations incoporated in parent Claim 1, the scope of limitation in Claim 1 is thereby changed and may be somewhat away from original prior art search. Reconsideration and new search are thereby both required to be sure of such new limitations are covered.

The Examiner has fully studied Applicants' key arguments in pages 6-9 of Remarks. However, in the case of current 103 rejection being overcome some other references may be further applied to teach such two additional limitations.

Dependent Claim 4 may also have the same above-mentioned issues needed to be answered.

In summary, reconsideration and new search is thereby required to be sure of such questions being answered